

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on March 20, 2009, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1,2,4,5 and 14 are amended. The amendment to the claims is fully supported by the originally filed written description, claims, and drawings. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment to the claims does not add new matter.

Specification

The minor informalities in the specification that the Examiner has kindly pointed out in paragraph 5 of the Office Action have been corrected by virtue of the amendment to the specification. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the specification.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In particular, the Examiner has stated that:

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner has stated that the limitation of "rotating the form image by 90° and repeating step (c) in the case of said comparison between the detected graphic image and the spatial orientation model yielding a match that is below a predetermined threshold" is not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 3, the limitation "determining the spatial orientation comprises setting up and examining hypotheses and corresponding matching reliability estimations" is not described in the specification.

Claims 6-9, 11-13, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected by the virtue of their dependency upon claim 1.

By virtue of the paragraphs added to page 8 of the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the limitation of the claims are 1, 3, 6-9, 11-13, 16, 18 and 19 are described in the specification. The paragraphs added to page 8 of the specification are fully supported by the originally filed specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

§101 Rejection of the Claim

The claims have been amended to make clear that the method of analysis is performed by a machine. As described in the specification, the field of the invention is optical character recognition and one skilled in the art would understand the type of machine that would be required to perform the analysis. Since, the claims are tied to a machine, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are statutory under §101.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (650) 903 2257 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 503437

Respectfully submitted,

Konstantin Zuev et al.

By their Representatives,

Hahn and Moodley LLP
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Date 8/20/2009

By /Vani Moodley

Reg. No. 56631